Supply of Electric Power to the Villages on Pala-Badami Road in Dharwar District.

Q.–1759. Smt. LEELAVATI MAGADI (Shirahatti).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that administrative sanction had been accorded by the Bombay Government for the supply of electricity to villages along Pala-Badami road in Dharwar District;

(*b*) the reasons for not taking up the work;

(*c*) when do they propose to take up the work;

(*d*) the steps they propose to take to electrify this area?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The work was found to be unremunerative.

(*c*) It is proposed to take up the work after the Scheme becomes remunerative.

(*d*) It is proposed to conduct fresh surveys and prepare detailed estimates.

Qualifications prescribed for Post of Chemical Examiner.

Q.—2835. Sri T. PARTHASARATHY (Malleswaram).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether the qualifications prescribed for the Chemical Examiner in Mysore are the same as those of the Chemical Examiners of other States particularly the Chemical Examiner of Bombay and West Bengal;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that pure chemists are debarred from becoming chemical examiners in Mysore whereas the chemical examiners of other States, particularly Bombay and West Bengal are pure chemists without any medical qualifications?

A.—Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Health).—

(*a*) No.

(*b*) In Mysore the Chemical Health Examiner is also the Superintendent of the Public Health Institute. Therefore it is reasonable that the qualifications for the combined post in Mysore are different from the qualifications of the non-combined post in Bombay or West Bengal.

Restoration of Kempanapura Tank in Chamarajanagar Taluk.

Q.—2853. Sri U. M. MADAPPA (Chamarajanagar).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the cost of the estimates prepared for the restoration and repairs of Kempanapura tank in Chamarajanagar taluk;

(*b*) the date on which the estimate was prepared;

(*c*) if sanction accorded, the date on which it was sanctioned;

(*d*) if it is not sanctioned the reason for the same?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) Rs. 59,300 for restoration. No estimate prepared for repairs.

(*b*) September 1949.

(*c*) Not sanctioned.

(*d*) The restoration of Kempanapura Inam major tank was dropped since the Inamdars were not then agreable to pay the cost of the estimate.

Members' Representation

Admissibility of questions on Government Officers.

*Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Turuvekere).–I would like to draw the attention of the Chair to Clause (*h*) of Rule 25 of our Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business and very respectfully submit that the ruling given offends that clause.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Sri G. SIVAPPA (Chitradurga).—I also rise to a point of order, Sir.

9-30 A.M.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—The members will kindly allow me to have my say. It takes away the right of members to put questions about officers with regard to their conduct and character in their official capacity and I would request the Chair to take such suitable steps as it deems fit. If an officer is absent and if a question is put on the floor of the House about the conduct of such an officer in the discharge of his duties, I respectfully submit that it becomes admissible.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I draw the attention of the Hon'ble Member to Clause (1) also in this connection. It says that 'it shall not make or imply a charge of a personal character'. I have already said that I will not disallow any questions respecting any officer in his official or public capacity, but that I will disallow only allegations of a personal character against any officer. My friends will bear with me that when I say this it will have to be understood according to the circumstances. If an officer is not doing his duty properly or if he is lax or if he keeps the work pending, then it comes under official or public capacity. But if it is said that an officer is corrupt or has practised nepotism, it is covered by clause (1).

*Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Krishnarajanagar).—When the Hon'ble Member Sri Boranna Gowda put a question as to whether the officer was corrupt, the Chair was pleased to say that it would not allow it. Will not questions such as whether the officer took bribe in his official capacity or whether complaints have come or not come under Rule 25 (h)? They will not come under Rule 25 (1).

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Members are under an impression that an officer takes bribe or practises corruption as a part of his duty, that is not correct. That is not part of his duty. No doubt, he takes undue advantage of his position when he takes bribe. I still think he takes bribes not in the capacity of an officer discharging his duties, but, as one who misuses his office.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—If he is not an officer, who will go and bribe him?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He might misuse his powers. What I say is that official capacity or official work is something different. I have to construe it in a strict sense. Whatever duties an officer is entrusted with under the law come under his official capacity. If an officer misuses his powers, that does not come under his official duties.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—The Chair will kindly excuse me. I do not want to enter into a discussion. I only wanted to express my fears. It means that no question of corruption against any Government officer can be brought in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is what I say. No charges of corruption against an individual officer can be brought in this House. If the charges of corruption are against a Department or against a group of officers, they can be made. My ruling may be quite convenient to the officers. If we go on making allegations against officers, it will end in chaos. I am clear about it. How are we interested in making charges against an officer? The Hon'ble Member Sri Subramanya was not here when I gave the ruling. I shall read it out again.

> "With reference to the question tabled by you, I am directed to state that with regard to questions relating to individual officers who are not in a position to defend themselves on the floor of the House and where harm would be done to services by the mere fact of putting questions which may not be true, it is a well established parliamentary convention that such matters should be taken up in the first instance with the Minister concerned. In case the Minister's explanation does not satisfy the member or the Minister does not offer any explanation at all, he may table the question after convincing the Speaker as to why the member is not satisfied with the Minister's explanation and whether he possesses sufficient

ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಕ Accession No. 4775 (B)
ದಿನಾಂಕ Date.....

material to substantiate his charges against the officer and also whether the Minister has not replied to him at all or taken any other action in the matter."

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಹತ್ತಿರಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲ ನಮಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಅವರ ಚೇಂಬರ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲ ಏನಾದರೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಆಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಹೌಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲೂ ಹೇಳಿ ಬಾರದು, ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಚೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ; ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬಹುದಲ್ಲಾ ನಾವು 3 ತಿಂಗಳಕಾಲ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯೆಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಚೇಂಬರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮಗೆ ಕನ್‌ವಿನ್ಸ್ ಆಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಕನ್‌ವಿನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I may say, Sir, that the Hon'ble Members of this House are responsible people and they take the responsibility for any statements or allegations they make on the floor of the House. With all due deference to the Chair, I feel that the Chair cannot direct us to go to a Minister. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನೀಗ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ. ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು allow ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲವೇ disallow ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇದು ಬೇರೆವಿಷಯ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿರಬಹುದು, ಕೆಲವು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು admissible ಎಂತಲೂ, ತಪ್ಪಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು inadmissible ಎಂದೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಾವೀಗ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರ್ತುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಛೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಛೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲ, perhaps may not be in order ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದ.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್ (ಡಳ್ಳಿಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ಮಾತೆತ್ತಿದರೆ "ನನ್ನ ಛೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಬನ್ನಿ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್‌ಗಳ ಛೇಂಬರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ" ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ? Why should you give us a direction to go here and there? We are here to put questions and get answers. If we feel like going to the Ministers we will go even without yo ur direction. It is not correct that the Chair should direct us to go here and there. On the floor of the House you have the right either to allow us to put the question or not to allow us to put the question. Beyond that it would not be correct for you to ask us to go here and there. You can refer to hundreds of years of legislative procedure. You will nowhere find such a practice. We have been patiently waiting all this time thinking that we should not take recourse to questioning the right of the Chair to do this.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—When the Chair gives a ruling, I want the Chai. to kindly reply to this point also. Under what provisions of the rules of procedure or the Constitution of India is the Chair exercising the right of asking the members of this House to go to the Minister or the Chamber of the Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will make a full statement tomorrow in this respect. I have heard the members patiently, but I cannot understand the sensitive nature of Hon'ble Members. I will look into all the rulings of the different legislatures and of Parliament in this respect, whether it would be correct on my part to direct the members to go to the chambers of the Ministers or to my chamber. These are the two points raised. I will give a ruling in this respect tomorrow.

*Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—I would like to draw the attention of the Chair to rule 25 (*e*). It says that any member of this House making a statement holds himself responsible for the accuracy of that statement. Suppose a member of this House makes a statement alleging corruption against a particular officer, then he will be held liable. The Speaker has got the right to call upon that member to substantiate his statement, but that does not take away the right of the member, if he has information in his possession, to ask on the floor of the House about the conduct of a particular officer in discharge of his duties as a public officer. What is not proper

(SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO)

or not contemplated under this is covered in (1). (1) refers to matters or charges of a personal character. Personal character is entirely different from the public duties and his character as an officer. Therefore, this House has the right, because it is this House through which this Government or this machinery works. The very object of the question hour would be defeated if we are not allowed to raise such questions on the floor of the House. If in the opinion of a particular member the administration is not functioning as it should by the fact that an officer has not been conducting himself in the manner he is expected to do, then I believe we have a right to raise that question on the floor of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may read (*e*). He may also read (*f*) which says that it shall not contain arguments, inferences or defamatory statements. Whether there is a defamatory statement or not, who is to decide? The Chair has to decide. As the Hon'ble Member Sri Subramanya said just now it is for the Chair to give the ruling on that. The decision of the Chair may be correct or it may not be correct. If it is correct it is all right, but if it is not correct, there might arise an occasion for him to revise it later on. Anyway it has to be accepted for the present. I feel that the Hon'ble Member should read both (*f*) and (*l*). I have already said that I am going to give a ruling tomorrow in this respect after having heard all the members.

SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Rule 27 also may be seen. It says what should be ruled out and what should not be ruled out.

MR. SPEAKER.—Rule 27 cannot be construed in contravention of rule 25.

*SRI N. RACHIAH.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Subramanya has brought to your notice what should be done when points dealing with the constitutional provisions or the rules of procedure arise. I have already said once that when such issues arise and if some members want to express their opinion just to guide the Chair and also the rules of procedure, the Speaker has to concede that. Then such questions will not arise. Now the question is whether a member of this House can question the conduct of an officer. As you are aware, the House and the business of this House should be regulated by the rules of procedure as contemplated by the Constitution in a parliamentary democracy. Besides that, there is also a convention which is to be regulated by the Speaker, but anything said by the Speaker cannot be a convention. It must be very accurate and in consonance with parliamentary democracy. If the Speaker wants to say that all that he says is convention, then he must take the full House into his confidence and convince the House that what he says is in keeping with the dignity and decorum of the House and also in the best interest of the House itself. You yourself just now said that irrespective of whether members were right or wrong or whether they knew the rules of procedure or not, when they said something, the Speaker's duty was to see whether it was in consonance with the rules of procedure or not. But the Speaker says that the members are saying something imaginary. I have not heard this in any parliamentary democracy.

MR. SPEAKER.—You are not covering any new ground. I have already said what I had to say in the matter.

SRI N. RACHIAH.—I am not questioning what you have said. I am cooperating with you. It is the responsibility of the Chair to regulate the business of this House; it is equally the responsibility of all the members here to co-operate with the Chair and see that a smooth running of the business of the House is achieved. This must be borne in mind by the Speaker. Why I say this is for this reason. Suppose you say something and immediately I say that it is not correct, then I can withdraw what I say, but you cannot withdraw what you say. If a member says something unparliamentary then you can ask him to withdraw it and he can then withdraw it but you cannot withdraw whatever you say. That is why I say that whatever is said by the Speaker cannot be taken as convention unless he convinces the

House that what he says is correct. If the House is not convinced of what the Speaker says, then what the Speaker says cannot be a convention.

Therefore, I submit that whenever the Speaker gives a ruling it is binding on the House and hence it should be such that it is in the best interest of the House. So, I request the Chair to allow members to express their views whenever issues of this nature are before the House. At the same time, the Speaker may be very careful in saying words because he is not in a position to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard the Hon'ble Members quite carefully. I have said that I am going to make a statement day after tomorrow. I have reason to feel that I am on surer ground in this respect. Anyway, I am going to examine the position carefully. But the Hon'ble Members should also know that I have my responsibilities and duties to perform. In the performance of such duties, supposing I happen to be at cross roads with the opinions of some of the Hon'ble Members, they will bear with me because, after all, in this House the opinion and the views of the Speaker will have to prevail. I am not so conceited as to claim that what I say is true and what other members say is not. There must be some end to this matter. The ruling of the Chair must always be taken as binding. If the ruling is found to be not correct, I will take the first opportunity to make the ruling correct in time to come. It is also not my conviction that whatever I say is the convention. If any Hon'ble member were to point out to me that this is not in consonance with the established convention, I am going to revise my views. Personally, I would not desire that whatever I say should be taken as correct. As it is, when the Chair gives a ruling, it must be taken as binding on the House.

So far as referring members to the Chambers of the Ministers and the Chamber of the Speaker is concerned, I am going to look into the authorities and give a ruling day after tomorrow. Of course, it is not for me to say in so many words, but I know in other Assemblies that the Members are referred to the Chambers of the Ministers and Speaker, because unless we co-operate with each other outside the floor of the Assembly, we cannot carry on with the business of the House. In view of what I have pointed out members may go to the Chambers of the Ministers and convince themselves.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I thought originally the Speaker said that he was going to review the whole thing and if he had to reconsider and revise that, he would do so. But the later part of a Speaker's statement now is that he will consider whether his referring a member to the Ministers' Chambers is correct or not; that is not my point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No; all the points raised will be examined. I am looking into the authorities and give the ruling.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Very good, Sir.

(*Sri H. M. Channabasappa rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, no; let us put an end to further discussion.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO (Basavangudi).—Sir, may I also request the Chair to find out the reason why members are becoming so sensitive? (*Laughter*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—That Short Notice Question will be taken up tomorrow.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—The simple answer to my question is: the issue is one of privilege. If my learned friend is not conscious of that, nobody can help him. It is a definite question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let us look into the matter tomorrow.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಲಿಸ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ತಮಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮತಿ ಪೊರತಮೇಲೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಲಿಸ್ಟಿನ ಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯೊಳಗೇ ತಾವು "ಸ್ಪ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು" ಮಾಡುವಂತಹ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನವ್ಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಮೊದಲು "ಸ್ಪ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು" (split) ಎನ್ನುವ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪೇಪರು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಮೊದಲು ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ನೋವುಂಟಾಗುವುದಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ''ಸ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು'' 'ಎನ್ನುವ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ''ವಿತ್‌ಡ್ರಾ'' ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವನ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾನ ಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾನ ಶೆಟ್ಟರು, ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು, ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಯಾಯಿತು ಅಷ್ಟೇ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವವರೆಲ್ಲ ಒಂದಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದರಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಲಿಸ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ತಮಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆಯದಿವನ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರು ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾನ ಶೆಟ್ಟರ ಹೆಸರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇತ್ತು. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸಂಘಟಿತರಾಗಿ ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಾವೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರಂತೆ ನಾವು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ತಾವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾನಶೆಟ್ಟರೇ ನಿಕಾಲೆಯಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ತಪ್ಪೇನಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಿಮಗೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದರೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಇವರಿಬ್ಬರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the Mysore Legislature Members' (Medical Attendance) Rules, 1958, issued under subsection (1) of section 15 of the Mysore Legislature Salaries Act, 1956.

(*Sri B. K. Puttaramiya interrupted.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Did you not yield to Sri Mallaradhya, Sri Srinivas Shetty?

*Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—I did, Sir, but I may be permitted to make a statement. Yesterday, my name was in the list and I stood up several times but my chance came in the last. I rose and Sri Mallaradhya also rose and you said, 'either you or Sri Mallaradhya'. I said, 'Sri Mallaradhya may speak'. That was the state of affair. I have no complaint about the Chair. But, I should like to make one other point clear. I was under the impression that because my name was in the list, I would be called upon to speak. This is not the first time that it has so happened. In one instance I had to wait for five days during the budget discussion, every time standing up and sitting down. I do not mind if my name is not included; but, let it be known when my name is there and when another member's name is not there, let the Chair not expect us to get up dozens of times.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not the PSP list alone. There is the Congress list also and there are the independents who will have to be considered for a chance. I have to satisfy all. Sometimes Hon'ble Members have to wait for a long time. I cannot help it. It also happens that some persons may not get an opportunity at all.

10 A.M.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—Is the Chair strictly following the list, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

BUDGET FOR 1958-59—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

Demand No. 18—Ports and Pilotage.

30. *Ports and Pilotage.*

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,91,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1959 in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

Demand No. 33—Territorial and Political Pensions

54-*A. Territorial and Political Pensions.*

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,63,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1959 in respect of 'Territorial and Political Pensions'."